

Crossover From Strong to Weak Pairing States in $t - J - U$ Model Studied by A Slave Spin Method

Wei-Cheng Lee^{1,*}

¹*Department of Physics, Applied Physics, and Astronomy,
Binghamton University - State University of New York, Binghamton, 13902, USA*

We investigate the superconductivity in the $t - J - U$ model within a slave-spin formalism. We show that the BCS mean-field theory implemented with the slave spin formalism naturally predicts two distinct gaps which are the pairing gap of the spinons Δ_f and the Cooper pairing gap of the electrons $\Delta_{SC} = Z\Delta_f$, where Z is the quasiparticle weight. Furthermore, we find that the nature of the superconducting state depends crucially on the interaction providing the pairing mechanism. For spin interactions, the bandwidth of the spinon hopping term is renormalized by Z but the its pairing term is not. As a result, if U exceeds the critical value for the Mott insulating state at half-filling, Z develops a strong doping dependence, leading to a doping-driven crossover from strong to weak pairing states. In the strong pairing state, while Δ_f is enhanced as $x \rightarrow 0$, $\Delta_{SC} \sim x$ due to the renormalization of Z . In the weak pairing state, Z does not change with x significantly. Therefore, Δ_{SC} is mainly controlled by Δ_f , and both of them go to zero at larger doping. The crossover from strong to weak pairing states is well captured by the slave spin formalism within reasonable range of parameters just at the mean-field level, indicating the slave spin formalism is a powerful tool to study correlated materials. For charge interactions, we find that the bandwidth of the spinon hopping term and its pairing term are renormalized by Z and Z^2 respectively. Consequently, both Δ_f and Δ_{SC} are suppressed at small x in large U , and no crossover will occur. The implication of our results for the superconducting states in correlated materials will be discussed.

PACS numbers: 74.20.-z, 74.20.Mn, 71.10.Fd

Introduction – The physics of the high temperature cuprate superconductors is usually attributed to doping a Mott insulator[1]. Theoretically, it is believed that the Hubbard model describing the strong onsite Coulomb repulsive interaction holds a crucial key to uncloak the mystery of the cuprates. While the Hubbard model has been shown to capture various experimental results qualitatively[1], how the system evolves from strongly to weakly coupled by the doping in the Hubbard model remains a challenging question.[2] To account for the d -wave superconductivity observed in cuprates, the $t - J$ model derived from a second order perturbation theory on the Hubbard model via the superexchange mechanism is often employed to study the relation between antiferromagnetism near zero doping and the d -wave superconductivity at finite dopings.[3–7] While the $t - J$ model predicts both the antiferromagnetism and the d -wave superconducting state naturally at the mean-field level, the no-double occupation constraint, which is a requirement of two electrons prohibited on the same site, is very difficult to handle. Moreover, since this constraint is exact only at infinite U , the $t - J$ model usually fails to reproduce the weakly interacting limit at larger doping. In order to overcome these difficulties, the $t - J - U$ model[8–13] is proposed to be another promising candidate to describe the cuprates, in which the notorious no-double occupation constraint is relaxed by considering the onsite Hubbard interaction U directly. It is then expected that a $t - J - U$ model with a finite but large U could possibly combine all the merits of the Hubbard and the $t - J$ models, but to do so, a reliable treatment for

the Hubbard U term is necessary, which unfortunately routes back to the original question to be solved.

Recently, the slave spin formalism has been widely used to study the Mott transition in multiorbital systems. [14–23] In this formalism, while the physical spin of the electron is described by the same fermionic spinon f used in the slave-boson approach,[1, 24–26] the charge degrees of freedom are represented by a quantum spin 1/2. As a result, the charge fluctuations can be described by spin flips between zero and one charge states, subject to a constraint on each site to remove the enlarged Hilbert space. The advantage of this method is that the dimension of the Hilbert space enlarged by the slave spin is finite, which leads to a more controllable mean-field theory. Surprisingly, it has been shown that even at the mean-field level, the slave spin formalism can obtain the Mott insulating state in a good agreement with the dynamical mean-field theory (DMFT), and the quasiparticle weight Z obtained in the large U limit reproduces the famous Gutzwiller approximation $g_t = 2x/(1+x)$. [16, 27, 28]

Motivated by these advantages, we develop a BCS theory implemented with the slave spin formalism to study the superconducting state in the $t - J - U$ model. Two distinct gaps, the spinon pairing gap Δ_f and the superconducting gap $\Delta_{SC} = Z\Delta_f$, arise naturally. We find that a crossover from strong to weak pairing states driven by the doping x could occur as U exceeds the critical value U_c for the Mott insulating state at half-filling. Moreover, the doping dependences of Δ_f and Δ_{SC} are found to differ fundamentally in the strong and the weak pairing states, and a superconducting dome ap-

pears as a direct consequence of the crossover. On the other hand, if the pairing is induced by charge interactions, e.g., nearest-neighbor attractive Coulomb interaction, no crossover would occur. All the results are obtained at the mean-field level within reasonable ranges of the model parameters, which demonstrates that the slave spin formalism is a powerful technique to study physics related to transition from strong to weak coupling states within the same framework.

Model and Formalism – We consider a generic single band $t - J - U$ model $H = H_t + H_J + H_U$, where

$$\begin{aligned} H_t &= \sum_{ij,\sigma} t_{ij} c_{i\sigma}^\dagger c_{j\sigma}, \quad H_U = U \sum_i n_{i\uparrow} n_{i\downarrow}, \\ H_J &= J \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} \vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j. \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

$J/t = 0.4$ is used for every calculation. We employ the $U(1)$ version of the slave spin formalism[19] to treat the Hubbard U term, thus the electron creation operator is represented by

$$c_{i\sigma}^\dagger = S_{i\sigma}^+ f_{i\sigma}^\dagger, \quad (2)$$

where $f_{i\sigma}^\dagger$ creates a physical spin σ at site i and $S_{i\sigma}^+$ creates a charge $-e$ at site i . The constraint to project out the unphysical state is $S_{i\sigma}^z = f_{i\sigma}^\dagger f_{i\sigma} - 1/2$. H_J term is decomposed into the d -wave superconducting channel by the same Hubbard-Stratonoch fields proposed by Ubbens and Lee.[24] Because H_J describes interactions between physical spins, the terms generated from H_J will not involve slave spin degrees of freedom at the mean-field level. The resulting mean-field pairing term is

$$H_J^{MF} = -\frac{J'}{2} \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} \Delta_f^{ij*} f_{i\uparrow}^\dagger f_{j\downarrow} - f_{i\downarrow}^\dagger f_{j\uparrow} + h.c., \quad (3)$$

where $J' = 3J/4$, and $\Delta_f^{ij} \equiv \langle f_{i\uparrow}^\dagger f_{j\downarrow} - f_{i\downarrow}^\dagger f_{j\uparrow} \rangle$ is the spinon pairing order parameter which has the d -wave symmetry of $\Delta_f = \Delta_f^{i,i+\hat{x}} = -\Delta_f^{i,i+\hat{y}}$. Next we follow the $U(1)$ slave spin formalism to treat $H_t + H_U$ terms[19], and the procedure is described briefly below. We start by performing the standard Hubbard-Stratonoch transformation to decouple the spinon and the slave spin degrees of freedom so that we can write down their Hamiltonians separately. Next, we assume that the dynamics of the slave spins is the same for each site, thus the mean-field slave-spin Hamiltonian is reduced to a single site problem which can be diagonalized exactly. Finally, we solve the corresponding mean-field equations subject to the constraint which is satisfied on the average at the mean-field level.

The final mean-field Hamiltonians are

$$H^{f,MF} = \sum_{\vec{k}} \left[\sum_{\sigma} (Z_{\sigma} \epsilon(\vec{k}) - \mu) f_{\vec{k}\sigma}^\dagger f_{\vec{k}\sigma} \right]$$

$$\begin{aligned} & - [\Delta(\vec{k}) f_{\vec{k}\uparrow}^\dagger f_{-\vec{k}\downarrow} + h.c.], \\ H^{s,MF} &= \sum_{\sigma} (\epsilon^{\sigma\sigma} \langle \tilde{z}_{\sigma} \rangle \tilde{z}_{\sigma}^\dagger + h.c.) + \lambda_{\sigma} S_{\sigma}^z \\ & + U(S_{\uparrow}^z + \frac{1}{2})(S_{\downarrow}^z + \frac{1}{2}), \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where $Z_{\sigma} \equiv |\langle \tilde{z}_{\sigma} \rangle|^2$ is the quasiparticle weight, $\epsilon(\vec{k}) = 2t(\cos k_x + \cos k_y)$, $\Delta(\vec{k}) = J' \Delta_f^*(\cos k_x - \cos k_y)$, and $\tilde{z}_{\sigma} = S_{\sigma}^- / \sqrt{(1/2 + \delta)^2 - |\langle S_{\sigma}^z \rangle|^2}$ where δ is an infinitesimal value to regularize $\langle \tilde{z}_{\sigma} \rangle$ for the case of $\langle S_{\sigma}^z \rangle = 1/2$. $\epsilon^{\sigma\sigma} = \frac{1}{\Omega} \sum_{\vec{k}} \epsilon(\vec{k}) \langle f_{\vec{k},\sigma}^\dagger f_{\vec{k},\sigma} \rangle$ is the average kinetic energy of the spinon with spin σ . The parameters of Δ_f , Z_{σ} , μ , and λ_{σ} are obtained by solving the corresponding mean-field equations subject to the following constraint

$$1 - x = \frac{1}{\Omega} \sum_{\vec{k},\sigma} \langle f_{\vec{k},\sigma}^\dagger f_{\vec{k},\sigma} \rangle = 1 + \sum_{\sigma} \langle S_{\sigma}^z \rangle, \quad (5)$$

where x is the doping away from the half-filling. The derivation of the mean-field equations can be found in Supplementary Materials. In the present work, we only focus on spin singlet pairing state, and consequently all the parameters are spin-independent. We will drop the σ index from now on.

Once the mean-field equations are solved, we can obtain the electron pairing order parameter, which is also the true superconducting order parameter, by

$$\Delta_{SC} = \langle S_{i\uparrow}^- S_{j\downarrow}^- \rangle \Delta_f \approx Z \Delta_f \quad (6)$$

Results – It is instructive to discuss the limits of $U \rightarrow 0$ and $U \rightarrow \infty$. For $U \rightarrow 0$, $Z \approx 1$ and $\Delta_f \approx \Delta_{SC}$. As a result, we recover the standard mean-field results on $t - J$ model without no-double occupation constraint, which only has single gap and the largest gap is found at the half-filling. On the other hand, for $U \rightarrow \infty$, Z reduces to the Gutzwiller factor $g_t = 2x/(1+x)$ and Δ_f and Δ_{SC} become two distinct gaps. From $H^{f,MF}$ in Eq. 4, because the kinetic energy term is renormalized by Z while the pairing term is not, the spinon pairing Δ_f is greatly enhanced at small x , and the effect of Z becomes insignificant at larger x . In contrast, because the electron pairing gap Δ_{SC} is given by Eq. 6, $\Delta_{SC} \sim x$ at small x and $\sim \Delta_f$ at large x . As a result, a crossover from strong to weak pairing states driven by the doping x is expected in the large U limit, which leads to a superconducting dome naturally. The mean-field results demonstrating the crossover are plotted in Fig. 1. Clearly, the crossover occurs around $U_c/t \approx 11$, and the doping dependences of Δ_f and Δ_{SC} change dramatically, consistent with our discussion given above. Fig. 2 presents the results with different U/t as a function of x . It is remarkable to see a dome-like shape naturally appear in $\Delta_{SC}(x)$ for $U/t \geq 12$, and the 'optimal doping' (the doping with largest Δ_{SC}) is pushed to higher doping as U increases, as expected. We also plot out Z and compare it with




FIG. 1: (a) The spinon pairing order parameter Δ_f as a function of U for different doping x . Δ_f increases with the increase of U and it is always larger at small x . An abrupt increase of Δ_f occurs as $U/t > 11$ due to the abrupt decrease of Z , indicating a crossover to the strong pairing state. (b) The electron pairing order parameter Δ_{SC} as a function of U for different doping x . In the strong pairing state ($U/t > 11$), Δ_{SC} is limited by Z , thus $\Delta_{SC} \sim x$ at small x . (c) The quasiparticle weight Z as a function of U for different doping x .

the Gutzwiller approximation $g_t = 2x/(1+x)$. The slave spin method indeed matches the Gutzwiller approximation very well at small x , and the high order corrections due to the finite U become significant at larger x .

We want to emphasize several advantages of the slave spin formalism compared to the traditional slave boson approach. In the traditional slave boson approach, the charge degrees of freedom are represented by the slave bosons which are usually assumed to have Bose-Einstein condensate at mean-field level. As a result, the bosonic degrees of freedom are in fact treated classically. In the slave spin formalism, both the slave spin and the spinon are treated quantum mechanically at the mean-field level already, which is the main reason why it can capture

various exotic strongly correlated states at the mean-field level. Second, although the slave boson approach can qualitatively obtain a quasiparticle weight $Z \sim x$, it is not straightforward to obtain the Gutzwiller factor g_t directly from the Hubbard model in the large U limit. Recently, a new slave boson scheme that can correctly capture g_t in the large U limit has been proposed, but it has a serious drawback that the non-interacting limit can not be obtained. [29] In contrast, the mean-field equations based on the slave spin method are tailored to yield g_t in the large U limit, and the U(1) version can obtain the non-interacting limit correctly. As a result, it is crucial to use the slave spin formalism to study the crossover in the $t - J - U$ model discussed above, since it is necessary to treat both the strongly and the weakly interacting limits within the same framework.

Pairing from charge interactions – We can use the same framework to study the superconductivity induced from the attractive nearest neighbor Coulomb interaction, $H_C = -V \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} n_i n_j$. While H_C can induce a d -wave superconducting state just like H_J , we find that the behavior of the superconducting state is fundamentally different. Following the procedure of the slave spin formalism, H_C can be rewritten as:

$$H_C = -V \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} n_i n_j \approx -V Z^2 \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} n_i^f n_j^f, \quad (7)$$

where $n_i^f = \sum_{\sigma} f_{i\sigma}^\dagger f_{i\sigma}$. If we introduce the same Hubbard-Stratonovich fields proposed by Ubbens and Lee[24] to decouple Eq. 7 in d -wave pairing channel, the mean-field pairing term is:

$$H_C^{MF} = - \sum_{\vec{k}} Z^2 \Delta'(\vec{k}) f_{\vec{k}\uparrow} f_{-\vec{k}\downarrow} + h.c., \quad (8)$$

where $\Delta'(\vec{k}) = V \Delta_f (\cos k_x - \cos k_y)$. It can be seen that H_C^{MF} has a renormalization of Z^2 . Because the bandwidth of the spinon hopping term given in Eq. 4 is renormalized by Z only, the pairing term is more suppressed than the kinetic energy by a factor of Z , indicating that both Δ_f and Δ_{SC} would go to zero at small x in large U . As a result, the crossover observed in the case of the pairing driven by spin interactions will not happen in this case.

Discussion – At the first sight, it seems that the crossover discussed above could be understood as a version of BEC-BCS crossover[30–33] due to the reduction of the bandwidth. However, to reach the BEC regime, the chemical potential μ has to be smaller than the minimum of the band energy so that no Fermi surface is left and the system becomes ‘bosonic’. In our calculations, although the Fermi energy is reduced by Z , μ remains higher than the minimum of the band energy in every result, indicating that the fermionic pairing is still dominating. Physically, this can be understood as follows. The main effect of the Hubbard U is to suppress charges




FIG. 2: (a) The spinon pairing gap Δ_f as a function of x for $U/t = 2, 12, 16, 24$. The case of $U = 2$ represents the weak pairing limit. Other cases exhibit a strong enhancement with the decrease of x . (b) The corresponding electron pairing gap Δ_{SC} as a function of x . In the weak pairing limit ($U = 2$), Δ_{SC} decreases with x . Other cases exhibit the crossover from strong to weak pairing states with the decrease of x . At small x , Δ_{SC} is limited by Z so that $\Delta_{SC} \sim x$. At larger x , Δ_{SC} is mainly determined by the spinon pairing Δ_f , thus Δ_{SC} starts to decrease after a critical doping. It is interesting to note that a superconducting dome appears naturally. (c) The corresponding quasiparticle weight Z as a function of x . The black line represents the Gutzwiller factor $g_t = 2x/(1+x)$. The slave spin matches g_t at small doping very well.

from moving instead of providing extra glues for the pairing. Moreover, the Hubbard U tends to eliminate local pairing since it costs a large energy to put two electrons on the same site. Therefore, the pairing remains non-local despite of the kinetic energy being reduced by U , and the BEC picture does not work here.

To account for the phase transition at finite temperature in cuprates, an improvement beyond the mean-field level is necessary. In the present mean-field theory, Δ_f and Δ_{SC} have the same transition temperature as im-

plied in Eq. 6. This is due to the assumption of the slave spin dynamics being the same for each site. Generally speaking, both the quantum and the thermal fluctuations could invalidate this assumption. As a result, $\langle S_{i\uparrow}^- S_{j\downarrow}^- \rangle$ could deviate from Z beyond the mean-field level. If such a formalism beyond mean-field level is available, the transition temperatures of Δ_f and Δ_{SC} could be different. In this case, the superconducting phase is characterized by $Z \ll 1$, $\Delta_f \neq 0$, and $\langle S_{i\uparrow}^- S_{j\downarrow}^- \rangle \neq 0$, the pseudogap phase is characterized by $Z \ll 1$, $\Delta_f \neq 0$, and $\langle S_{i\uparrow}^- S_{j\downarrow}^- \rangle = 0$, and the strange metal phase is characterized by $Z \ll 1$, $\Delta_f = 0$, and $\langle S_{i\uparrow}^- S_{j\downarrow}^- \rangle = 0$. The present theory could be extended to the pairing state intertwined with other orders like charge density wave state, stripe state, etc.

Another drawback of the present slave spin formalism is that the renormalization on the spinon is not directly considered through the mean-field equations. In addition to g_t , the Gutzwiller approximation also leads to a renormalization factor $g_s = 4/(1+x)^2$ to the nearest neighbor antiferromagnetic Heisenberg interaction[27, 28], and we have assumed $g_s = 1$ in the present theory. Nevertheless, in the large U limit, we can replace J by $g_s J$ in the H_J term in the present slave spin formalism. Then it can be seen that $g_s J$ gets even bigger at small x , which simply makes the crossover more robust. As a result, we conclude that ignoring g_s in the present theory would not undermine the conclusion of our results. Ideally, one should obtain H_J term via the superexchange mechanism with the inclusion of the slave spin and then derive the mean-field equations with both H_J and H_U terms treated equally. Improvement of the slave spin formalism to overcome problems mentioned above is still in progress.

Conclusion— We have developed a BCS mean-field theory implemented with the slave-spin formalism and have investigated the superconducting states in the $t - J - U$ model. We have found that this formalism naturally predicts two distinct gaps, the spinon pairing gap Δ_f and the superconducting gap $\Delta_{SC} = Z\Delta_f$. For the case of the pairing arising from the spin interaction H_J , we have found that a crossover from strong to weak pairing states driven by the doping x could occur as U exceeds the critical value U_c for the Mott insulating state at half-filling. In the strong pairing regime, Δ_f is largely enhanced due to the reduction of the spinon bandwidth, but the superconducting gap $\Delta_{SC} \sim x$ at small x . In the weak pairing regime, both Δ_f and Δ_{SC} behave similarly. On the other hand, if the pairing is induced by charge interactions, both Δ_f and Δ_{SC} would go to zero at small x , and consequently no crossover would occur. We have obtained a superconducting dome in this phase diagram of Δ_{SC} vs x with reasonable parameters, and all the results are obtained at the mean-field level. Our results have demonstrated that the slave spin formalism is a powerful technique to study physics related to transition from strong to weak coupling states within the same framework.

Acknowledgement– We appreciate fruitful discussions with T. K. Lee. This work is supported by a start up fund from Binghamton University.

- [32] P. Pieri and G. C. Strinati, Phys. Rev. B **61**, 15370 (2000).
 [33] Q. Chen, J. Stajic, S. Tan, and K. Levin, Physics Reports **412**, 1 (2005).

* Electronic address: wlee@binghamton.edu

- [1] P. A. Lee, N. Nagaosa, and X.-G. Wen, Rev. Mod. Phys. **78**, 17 (2006).
 [2] P. Phillips, Rev. Mod. Phys. **82**, 1719 (2010).
 [3] T. K. Lee, C.-M. Ho, and N. Nagaosa, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 067001 (2003).
 [4] W.-C. Lee, T. K. Lee, C.-M. Ho, and P. W. Leung, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 057001 (2003).
 [5] M. Lugas, L. Spanu, F. Becca, and S. Sorella, Phys. Rev. B **74**, 165122 (2006).
 [6] F. Tan and Q.-H. Wang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 117004 (2008).
 [7] H. Ma, T. K. Lee, and Y. Chen, New Journal of Physics **15**, 043045 (2013).
 [8] S. Daul, D. J. Scalapino, and S. R. White, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 4188 (2000).
 [9] S. Basu, R. J. Gooding, and P. W. Leung, Phys. Rev. B **63**, 100506 (2001).
 [10] F. C. Zhang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 207002 (2003).
 [11] F. Yuan, Q. Yuan, and C. S. Ting, Phys. Rev. B **71**, 104505 (2005).
 [12] M. Abram, J. Kaczmarczyk, J. Jedrak, and J. Spalek, Phys. Rev. B **88**, 094502 (2013).
 [13] A. Farrell and T. Pereg-Barnea, Phys. Rev. B **89**, 035112 (2014).
 [14] L. de’Medici, A. Georges, and S. Biermann, Phys. Rev. B **72**, 205124 (2005).
 [15] L. de’ Medici, S. R. Hassan, M. Capone, and X. Dai, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 126401 (2009).
 [16] S. R. Hassan and L. de’ Medici, Phys. Rev. B **81**, 035106 (2010).
 [17] L. de’ Medici, Phys. Rev. B **83**, 205112 (2011).
 [18] R. Yu and Q. Si, Phys. Rev. B **84**, 235115 (2011).
 [19] R. Yu and Q. Si, Phys. Rev. B **86**, 085104 (2012).
 [20] R. Yu and Q. Si, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 146402 (2013).
 [21] L. de’ Medici, G. Giovannetti, and M. Capone, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 177001 (2014).
 [22] G. Giovannetti, L. de’ Medici, M. Aichhorn, and M. Capone, Phys. Rev. B **91**, 085124 (2015).
 [23] S. Mukherjee, N. F. Quackenbush, H. Paik, C. Schlueter, T.-L. Lee, D. G. Schlom, L. F. J. Piper, and W.-C. Lee, ArXiv e-prints (2016), 1603.00485.
 [24] M. U. Ubbens and P. A. Lee, Phys. Rev. B **46**, 8434 (1992).
 [25] G. Kotliar and A. E. Ruckenstein, Phys. Rev. Lett. **57**, 1362 (1986).
 [26] T. Li, P. Wölfe, and P. J. Hirschfeld, Phys. Rev. B **40**, 6817 (1989).
 [27] M. C. Gutzwiller, Phys. Rev. Lett. **10**, 159 (1963).
 [28] F. Gebhard, Phys. Rev. B **41**, 9452 (1990).
 [29] F. Lechermann, A. Georges, G. Kotliar, and O. Parcollet, Phys. Rev. B **76**, 155102 (2007).
 [30] J. Ranninger and J. M. Robin, Phys. Rev. B **53**, R11961 (1996).
 [31] Q. Chen, I. Kosztin, B. Jankó, and K. Levin, Phys. Rev. B **59**, 7083 (1999).

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

Here we derive the mean-field equations from Eq. 4 in the main text. First, we derive the BCS gap equation in the spinon sector. Using the Bogoliubov transformation, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} f_{\vec{k}\uparrow} &= \cos \frac{\theta_{\vec{k}}}{2} \alpha_{\vec{k},+} + \sin \frac{\theta_{\vec{k}}}{2} \alpha_{\vec{k},-}, \\ f_{-\vec{k}\downarrow}^\dagger &= \sin \frac{\theta_{\vec{k}}}{2} \alpha_{\vec{k},+} - \cos \frac{\theta_{\vec{k}}}{2} \alpha_{\vec{k},-}, \\ \cos \theta_{\vec{k}} &= \frac{|\langle \tilde{z}_\sigma \rangle|^2 \epsilon(\vec{k}) - \mu}{E(\vec{k})}, \quad \sin \theta_{\vec{k}} = \frac{\Delta(\vec{k})}{E(\vec{k})}, \\ E(\vec{k}) &= \sqrt{(|\langle \tilde{z}_\sigma \rangle|^2 \epsilon(\vec{k}) - \mu)^2 + \Delta^2(\vec{k})}. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

$\alpha_{\vec{k},\pm}$ are the Bogoliubov quasiparticles with eigen energies $\pm E(\vec{k})$. The self-consistent equations are:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_f &= \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{\vec{k}} d(\vec{k}) \sin \theta_{\vec{k}} \left[n_f(-E(\vec{k})) - n_f(E(\vec{k})) \right], \\ n &= 1 - x \\ x &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\vec{k}} \cos \theta_{\vec{k}} \left[n_f(-E(\vec{k})) - n_f(E(\vec{k})) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where $n_f(E)$ is the Fermi-Dirac function, and x is the doping away from the half-filling.

The iteration procedure is as follows. Starting from an initial guess of Z , we first solve the BCS gap equation in the spinon sector subject to the fixed doping x . Then,

we can compute the average kinetic energy of the spinon

$$\epsilon^{\sigma\sigma} = \frac{1}{\Omega} \sum_{\vec{k}} \epsilon(\vec{k}) \cos \theta_{\vec{k}} \left[n_f(-E(\vec{k})) - n_f(E(\vec{k})) \right], \quad (11)$$

which will be used in the mean-field Hamiltonian for the slave spin $H^{s,MF}$.

The constraint to remove the enlarged Hilbert space is

$$S_{i\sigma}^z = f_{i\sigma}^\dagger f_{i\sigma} - \frac{1}{2}. \quad (12)$$

This constraint will be taken into account after the slave spin mean-field Hamiltonian is diagonalized. Since the slave spin sector is effectively a single site problem in the mean-field theory, it can be diagonalized exactly. Then we determine λ by satisfying the constraint in Eq. 12 'on the average' by

$$M_\sigma \equiv \langle S_\sigma^z \rangle = \frac{1}{\Omega} \sum_{\vec{k}} \langle f_{k\sigma}^\dagger f_{k\sigma} \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \quad (13)$$

We can further simplify the above equation to

$$1 - x = M_\uparrow + M_\downarrow + 1 \rightarrow M_\uparrow + M_\downarrow = -x. \quad (14)$$

Since we are only interested in the spin singlet pairing states, we have $M_\uparrow = M_\downarrow = -x/2$.

After λ is determined, we can compute Z which will be used for the next cycle of the calculation. We repeat the procedure until the self-consistency is reached with an error less than 10^{-6} .